

PATENT APPLICATION
Docket No.: 3003.2.9A

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of: Sanchaita Datta and Ragula Bhaskar
Serial No.: 10/034,197
Filed: December 28, 2001
For: Combining Connections for Parallel Access to
Multiple Frame Relay and Other Private Networks

RESPONSE

Commissioner for Patents:

This case was **made special** by a Petition Decision mailed October 8, 2003.

In response to the Office Action mailed January 21, 2010, Applicants submit the following remarks.

Remarks

Concurrently Sending

As noted in Applicants' previous submission, each of the claims now presented has language requiring concurrently sending packets over different network interfaces of a controller. By contrast, Kitai does not even mention the word "concurrent".

In response to this argument, the Office Action asserted on page 2 that "Kitai does teach three connections are established (5790) and data communication is performed in accordance with **parallel** SEND/RECEIVE as shown in col. 17, line 63-col. 18 line 17." (emphasis in original)

However, "parallel" is not the same as "concurrent". Neighboring driveways are often parallel strips of concrete, but in many neighborhoods these parallel driveways are not used concurrently, because neighbors rarely if ever leave home or return home at the same time as one another. Likewise, in the computing world, a laptop may have a CPU containing parallel processors, but much software runs on only one processor at a time. Indeed, sometimes parallel circuits are intended for non-concurrent use, e.g., for failover.

"Parallel" means "being everywhere equidistant and not intersecting" in space, whereas "concurrently" means "at the same time, overlapping in duration" (*see* attached